



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,235	03/16/2004	James W. Fuller	67,097-053/EH-11071	2027

26096 7590 07/21/2006

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.
400 WEST MAPLE ROAD
SUITE 350
BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009

EXAMINER

PHAM, THOMAS K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2121

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/801,235

Applicant(s)

FULLER, JAMES W.

Examiner

Thomas K. Pham

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7-11,13,15,16,18 and 19 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-6,12,14 and 17 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

1. This is in response to the request for re-consideration filed 06/01/2006.
2. Claims 3-6, 12, 14 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 7-11, 13, 15, 16, 18 and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Quotations of U.S. Code Title 35

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claims 1-2, 7-11, 13, 15, 16, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallestey et al. "Model Predictive Control and Optimization of Power Plant Load While Considering Lifetime Consumption", February 2002, IEEE Transactions on power systems.

Regarding claim 1

Gallestey teaches the invention including a model predictive control system comprising: a desired trajectory generator for creating a desired dynamic response based upon commands; a model of plant dynamics starting with the current state of the system, a nonlinear programming module receiving the desired dynamic response and at least one system life goal and formulating a problem of achieving the desired dynamic response and the at least one system life goal for a window spanning one or more time steps as a solution to a nonlinear program problem using methods of model predictive control; and a nonlinear programming solver solving the nonlinear programming problem in each time step using an iterative algorithm based upon the model predictive control problem and a nonlinear programming algorithm IS TAUGHT as a model predictive control (MPC) approach is used to solve optimization problem in the trade off between maximization of a desired trajectory (i.e. immediate profits) and minimization of lifetime consumption to a plant (see abstract). Two approaches are used to implement a balance between users that are focusing heavily on the desired trajectory of immediate profits (Approach I) and users that also concerned about the lifetime consumption of their system (Approach II). The approaches are presented using methods of model predictive control (MPC) in form of non-linear algorithms (see pages 189-190, "Approach I", "Approach II" and "Numerical Results").

Although Gallestey does not specifically disclose the system is collecting data with a plurality of sensors indicating a current state of the system. Gallestey would obviously collect data about every aspect of the system in order to analyze the plant aging conditions or the state of system. Furthermore, the concepts and advantage of collecting data using plurality of sensors is well known and expected in the art. U.S. Patent No. 6,056,781 to Wassick discloses a model predictive controller for a process control system including a plurality of sensors for detecting the current state of the system (see col. 1 lines 27-42). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the various sensors for indicating current state of the system to Gallestey because it would provide the most efficient way to rapidly acquire input data about the system.

Regarding claim 7

Gallestey teaches the invention including a method for controlling a multivariable system including the steps of: receiving a plurality of commands; receiving at least one system life goal; determining a desired dynamic response of the system based upon the commands; and implementing a balance between the desired dynamic response and the at least one system life goal in a model predictive controller to generate a plurality of actuator commands IS TAUGHT as a model predictive control (MPC) approach is used to solve optimization problem in the trade off between maximization of a desired trajectory (i.e. immediate profits) and minimization of lifetime consumption to a plant (see abstract). Two approaches are used to implement a balance between users that are focusing heavily on the desired trajectory of immediate profits (Approach I) and users that also concerned about the lifetime consumption of their system (Approach II).

Art Unit: 2121

The approaches are presented using methods of model predictive control (MPC) in form of non-linear algorithms (see pages 189-190, "Approach I", "Approach II" and "Numerical Results").

Although Gallestey does not specifically disclose the system is collecting data with a plurality of sensors indicating current conditions of the system. Gallestey would obviously collect data about every aspect of the system in order to analyze the plant aging conditions or the state of system. Furthermore, the concepts and advantage of collecting data using plurality of sensors is well known and expected in the art. U.S. Patent No. 6,056,781 to Wassick discloses a model predictive controller for a process control system including a plurality of sensors for detecting the current state of the system (see col. 1 lines 27-42). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the various sensors for indicating current state of the system to Gallestey because it would provide the most efficient way to rapidly acquire input data about the system.

Regarding claim 19

Gallestey teaches the invention including a computer readable medium storing a computer program, which when executed by a computer performs the steps of: receiving a plurality of commands; receiving at least one system life goal; determining a desired dynamic response of the system based upon the commands; and implementing a balance between the desired dynamic response and the at least one system life goal in a model predictive controller to generate a plurality of actuator commands IS TAUGHT as a model predictive control (MPC) approach is used to solve optimization problem in the trade off between maximization of a desired trajectory (i.e. immediate profits) and minimization of lifetime consumption to a plant (see abstract). Two approaches are used to implement a balance between users that are focusing heavily on the

Art Unit: 2121

desired trajectory of immediate profits (Approach I) and users that also concerned about the lifetime consumption of their system (Approach II). The approaches are presented using methods of model predictive control (MPC) in form of non-linear algorithms (see pages 189-190, “Approach I”, “Approach II” and “Numerical Results”).

Although Gallestey does not specifically disclose the system is collecting data with a plurality of sensors indicating current conditions of the system. Gallestey would obviously collect data about every aspect of the system in order to analyze the plant aging conditions or the state of system. Furthermore, the concepts and advantage of collecting data using plurality of sensors is well known and expected in the art. U.S. Patent No. 6,056,781 to Wassick discloses a model predictive controller for a process control system including a plurality of sensors for detecting the current state of the system (see col. 1 lines 27-42). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the various sensors for indicating current state of the system to Gallestey because it would provide the most efficient way to rapidly acquire input data about the system.

Regarding claim 2

Gallestey teaches the at least one system life goal includes at least one limit (see page 189, “Approach II”).

Regarding claim 8

Gallestey teaches performed by weighting in a performance index for the model predictive controller (see page 189, “Approach II”).

Regarding claim 9

Art Unit: 2121

Gallestey teaches the step of changing the balance between the desired dynamic response and the at least one system life goal (see page 189, “Approach II”).

Regarding claim 10

Gallestey teaches the step of changing the weighting in the performance index to change the balance (see page 189, “Approach I” and “Approach II”).

Regarding claims 11, 15 and 18

Gallestey teaches the step of changing the weighting based upon an indication of a failure of a component in the system (see page 188, “Optimizing Plant Lifetime Consumption”).

Regarding claims 13 and 16

Gallestey teaches the step of setting a limit in a set of inequality equations for the model predictive controller (see page 189-190, “Numerical Solution”).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner *Thomas Pham*; whose telephone number is (571) 272-3689, Monday - Thursday from 6:30 AM - 5:00 PM EST or contact Supervisor *Mr. Anthony Knight* at (571) 272-3687.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to: **Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450**. Responses may also be faxed to the **official fax number (571) 273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thomas Pham
Patent Examiner



July 14, 2006